

**REMARKS**

Applicants have carefully reviewed the Office Action sent January 23, 2007. In this Office Action, it was asserted that the response to the Office Action mailed August 9, 2006 was not fully responsive. Specifically, it was asserted that reasoning was not provided pertaining to the patentability of claim 24 over the cited prior art (this claim was newly added in the previous response). The Examiner requested that specific argument be supplied as to why claim 24 is patentable over the cited prior art. Please note that claim 24 has also been amended with this paper to correct a typographical error.

In response, Applicants point out that Bagoisan discloses an aspiration catheter. The aspiration catheter can apparently have a variety of tip designs, for example those shown in Figures 8A-8C. For example, Figure 8C shows side ports 47 in the catheter. As stated at column 10, lines 48-50, "side ports 47 can be drilled along the distal tip of the catheter to enhance the aspiration rate, as illustrated in Figures 8C and 2."

In contrast, claim 24 recites, in part, a filtration device that has an expanded configuration and a collapsed configuration, and the filtration device in its collapsed configuration is sized to fit within the shaft lumen. The filtration device has first length in its collapsed configuration, and at least one of the one or more aspiration ports is located at least a second length from the distal end of the elongated shaft. The second length is greater than the first length.

Nothing in Bagoisan appears to disclose such a relationship between a filtration device and aspiration ports. In fact, it does not appear as though Bagoisan discusses the length of a filtration device in its collapsed configuration relative to the placement of aspiration ports at all. As such, Applicants respectfully assert that it is not possible that

Bagoisan discloses the relationship between a filtration device and aspiration ports as recited in claim 24. Because Bagoisan is missing at least this element of claim 24, this claim is allowable over this reference. Because it is dependent on claim 24 and because it has additional patentably distinct elements, Applicants also assert that claim 25 is allowable over this reference.


In light of the above argument and in light of the arguments presented in the previous response, Applicants believe that all of the pending claims are not in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert M. Rauker

By his Attorney,

Date: Feb. 12, 2007



Glenn M. Seager, Reg. No. 36,926  
CROMPTON, SEAGER & TUFTE, LLC  
1221 Nicollet Avenue, Suite 800  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55403-2420  
Tel: (612) 677-9050